



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,901	05/02/2001	Masajiro Inoue	SIW-008	7510
959	7590	04/15/2004	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			ALEJANDRO, RAYMOND	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745	

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,901

Applicant(s)

INOUE ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Alejandro

Art Unit

1745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/02/01 & 09/04/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/02/04 has been entered.

This action is in reply to the foregoing amendment. It is noted that the double patenting rejection, the 35 USC 102 rejection and the 35 USC 103 rejection still stand for the reasons of record:

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6699613 as evidenced by Jones 6007933. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1745

1. A fuel cell comprising:
 - 40 a membrane electrode assembly having a solid polymer electrolyte membrane, an anode side diffusion electrode disposed at one side of the solid polymer electrolyte membrane, and a cathode side diffusion electrode disposed at the other side of the solid polymer electrolyte membrane;
 - 45 a pair of separators which hold the membrane electrode assembly;
 - a projecting portion which extends from the solid polymer electrolyte membrane and which projects from the peripheries of the anode side diffusion electrode and the cathode side diffusion electrode; and
 - 50 a liquid sealant having viscosity provided on the separators, which hardens to provide a seal with a certain degree of elasticity, wherein
 - 55 the seal makes contact with the projecting portion while the membrane electrode assembly is disposed between the separators.
2. A fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the seal is provided in grooves formed in the separator.

As to the limitations of an anode side diffusion electrode comprising an anode electrode, and a first gas diffusion layer, and the cathode side diffusion electrode comprising a cathode electrode, and a second gas diffusion layer, it is noted that the copending Application No. 09/847895 inherently teaches such components because both the anode side diffusion electrode and the cathode side diffusion electrode (as instantly claimed in both co-pending applications) are understood to comprise respective anode electrode and its related gas diffusion element as well as respective cathode electrode and its related gas diffusion element. In this regard, it is noted that the claim language of US patent 6699613 reciting “an anode side diffusion electrode” and “a cathode side diffusion electrode” inherently encompasses that “the anode side diffusion electrode”, at least, comprises an electrode portion and a gas diffusion portion as well as that “the cathode side diffusion electrode”, at least, comprises another electrode portion and gas diffusion portion, too. However, in order to support the foregoing, Jones 6007933 is further cited herein to evidence US patent 6699613 regarding this. Accordingly, Jones '933 (see col 6, lines 44-50 and col 6, line 56 to col 7, line 9) evidences US patent 6699613 in that

Art Unit: 1745

respective anode and cathode side diffusion electrodes include: the anode and cathode sides, and anode and cathode gas diffusion layers, respectively, due to the intrinsic implication of the combined language reciting anode and cathode diffusion electrodes. Hence, those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that anode and cathode side diffusion electrodes comprises the anode and cathode side per se and gas diffusion elements on each side.

Upon review of claims 1-2 of the US patent 6699613, it has been noted that the limitation “the seal makes contact with the projection portion while the membrane electrode assembly is disposed between the separator” (claim 1 of US patent ’613), to some extent also encompasses the limitation “the seal makes contact with both end faces of the first gas diffusion layer and the second gas diffusion layer, while the membrane electrode assembly is located between the separators” (claim 1 of instant application ’901). Thus, such claim language of US patent 6699613 represents an obvious variation of the claim language in the instant application ’901 because the projection, as set forth in claim 1 of the US patent ’613, is a projecting portion which extends from the solid polymer electrolyte membrane and which projects from the peripheries of the anode side diffusion electrode and the cathode side diffusion electrode, thus, if the projection does not project from the peripheries of the anode side diffusion electrode and the cathode side diffusion electrode, the seal will necessarily contact both the first gas diffusion layer and the second gas diffusion layer. Thus, it is an obvious variation thereof.

It is further stated, in this case, the claim limitations of the instant application ’901 still appear to read on the claim language of the US patent 6699613. Thus, the claims of the US patent 6699613 still anticipate the present claims. In re Goodman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones 6007933.

The instant application is directed to a fuel cell wherein the disclosed inventive concept comprises the specific seal feature.

As to claim 1:

Jones discloses a fuel cell assembly including end plates and current collectors/conductor plates with a working section therebetween (col 5, lines 15-20); wherein working section includes a number of layers (col 5, lines 25-26); preferably, a plurality of layers form one or more PEM-type fuel cells (col 5, lines 35-38). PEM represents a proton exchange membrane or polymer Electrolyte membrane, the PEM is a solid polymer electrolyte (col 1, lines 26-38).

Figure 3 shows fluid flow plates serving as flow field plates in a fuel cell.




FIG. 3

As seen in Figure 3, fuel cell 300 includes the membrane electrode assembly (MEA) 310 comprising a solid polymer electrolyte 306, catalyst 308 and 308' which facilitate chemical reaction are applied to the anode and cathode sides, respectively of the solid polymer electrolyte.

Art Unit: 1745

This unit can be referred to as a membrane electrode assembly (col 6, line 56 to col 7, line 4).

The MEA is sandwiched between anode and cathode gas diffusion layers 312 and 312', respectively (col 7, lines 5-8).

For purposes of illustration, Figure 3 also depicts the fuel cell with fluid flow plates 200 and 200' serving as flow field plates (it is noted that separator plates are sometimes referred to as flow field plates, that is, separator plates are also conventionally known in the art as flow field plate), in particular, flow field plate 200 might serve as an anode side of the fuel cell, and flow field plate 200' might serve as a cathode side of the fuel cell. That is, face 202 might comprise an anode face, and face 202' might comprise a cathode face (col 6, lines 44-50).

Jones discloses that gasketing material or gaskets 304, 304' can be employed to seal peripheral holes. A given gasket might take the form of, for instance, a frame gasket made from polytetrafluoroethylene material (col 6, lines 34-42). As depicted in Figure 3, the gasketing material 304, 304' contacts the end faces of both gas diffusion layers 312 and 312'.

With respect to gasketing material or gasket, it is noted that a gasket is a material or a member used to make a joint fluid tight. Accordingly, gasketing material is a sealing agent which provides a tight closure to prevent the passage or return of fluids so as to close or male secure against access, leakage or passage. Thus, the gasketing material or gasket is interpreted to serve as a seal provided on the flow field plates.

Examiner's note: With respect to the limitation that the seal was liquid sealant at the time of application, it is noted that applicants disclose the liquid sealant hardens into solid sealant while maintaining certain degree of elasticity even after the seal has been formed; and that the liquid sealant is made of a thermosetting fluorine-containing (refer to page 11, third full

Art Unit: 1745

paragraph of applicants' specification). In that, it is noted that the recitation a seal, provided onto the separators, which was liquid sealant at the time of application is interpreted as a solid seal per se because such limitation refers to the initial state of the liquid sealant at the time of application, but the final state (the working seal) of the seal is solid as the liquid sealant hardens into solid sealant; accordingly, it is noted that Jones' teaching encompasses the solid seal formed to contact the fuel cell components. Thus, Jones' frame gasket made from polytetrafluoroethylene material (fluorine-container polymer) is a solid sealing material employed to provide a tight closure or seal in the fuel cell.

In addition, as to the method limitation, i.e. "which hardens to provide a seal with a certain degree of elasticity", it is noted that a method limitation incorporated into a product claim does not patentably distinguish the product because what is given patentably consideration is the product itself and not the manner in which the product was made. Therefore, the patentability of a product is independent of how it was made.

With respect to claim 2:

As illustrated in Figure 3, the edge of solid polymer membrane 306 extends beyond (extended/projecting portion) the end faces of the anode and cathode side; and the gasketing material 304, 304' contacts the extended portion of the solid polymer electrolyte.

With respect to claim 4:

As shown in Figure 3, the gasketing material 304, 304' contacts the end faces of both gas diffusion layers 312-catalyst 308 and gas diffusion layers 312'-catalyst 308' which are considered to be the anode and cathode electrode sides, respectively.

Thus, the present claims are still anticipated by Jones'933.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103


4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones 6007933 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Japanese publication JP 08-148169.

Jones is applied, argued and incorporated herein for the reasons above. However, Jones does not disclose the seal provided in grooves formed in the separator.

The JP'169 publication illustrates in Figure 2 a fuel cell structure including gas diffusion electrode wherein the separators 16, 17 provide grooves which are contacted and sealed by O-ring seals 15 (Figure 2 and section 0008).

【 図 2 】



In view of the above, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to seal Jones' separators by providing grooves thereon (*seal provided in grooves in the separator to seal them*) so as to obtain a seal-groove sealing structure as taught by the JP'169 publication as the JP'169 publication teaches that when plates or frames (separators) constitute the main enclosing member of the fuel cell structure, an O-ring seal disposed between grooves formed in the separator enhances and ensures the adhesion of both separators. Further, the O-ring-grooves sealing feature provides a sealing technique having the advantage of

Art Unit: 1745

employing adhesive forces without damaging fuel cell elements. Thus, this provides a sealing feature that ensures a sufficient sealing effect only through light pressing of the polymeric electrolyte film of fuel cell, and preventing damages to the electrolyte film per se. *The teaching of JP '169 is also consistent with another embodiment of Jones teaching and encompassing the employment of O-ring gaskets.*

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed along with the RCE of 04/02/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants' position that the recitation "a liquid sealant having a viscosity provided on the separators, which hardens to provide a seal with a certain degree of elasticity" carries patentable weight is respectfully disagreed with. In that, it is contended that applicants' seal needs to harden in order for the liquid sealant to be fully functional so as to satisfy its workable and structural interrelationship of providing a seal structure for sealing the fuel cell. That is to say, the sealant material in its liquid state fails to provide the necessary functional and/or structural distinction to support patentability because the liquid sealant which necessarily hardens to provide a seal, as instantly claimed, does not serve to precisely define or impart present structural attributes of interrelated fuel cell component/parts of the claimed invention. Accordingly (*as admitted by the applicants*), the prior art does disclose a solid gasket made from specified material and therefore, it is herein maintained that the solid (hardened) seal of the prior art provides the required physical attributes for implementing the defined requisite degree of functionality. Furthermore, the examiner also points out that *the solid gasket sealing material of the prior art* performs exactly the identical function specified in the instant claim in

Art Unit: 1745

substantially the same way, and produces substantially the same results as the claimed hardened liquid sealant of the present invention. Since there are insubstantial differences between *the solid gasket sealing material of the prior art* and the claimed hardened liquid sealant, the burden is shifted to the applicant to provide objective evidence demonstrating that Jones' solid gasketing sealing material when used as instantly claimed will indeed cause detrimental effects thereto.

Furthermore, with respect to the limitation, in particular, "which hardens to provide a seal with certain degree of elasticity", the examiner wishes to indicate that applicants disclose the liquid sealant hardens into solid sealant while maintaining certain degree of elasticity even after the seal has been formed; and that the liquid sealant is made of a thermosetting fluorine-containing (refer to page 11, third full paragraph of applicants' specification). In that, it is noted that the recitation "which hardens to provide a seal with certain degree of elasticity" is being interpreted as any solid seal per se because such limitation refers to the initial state of the liquid sealant at the time of application, but the final state, the working seal, of the seal is solid as the liquid sealant hardens into solid sealant; as a result, it is noted that Jones' teaching encompasses the solid seal formed to contact the fuel cell components. Thus, Jones' frame gasket made from the specified fluorine-containing polymer is a solid sealing feature employed to provide a tight closure or seal in the fuel cell.

Moreover, as to the method limitation, i.e. "which hardens to provide a seal with a certain degree of elasticity", it is noted that a method limitation incorporated into a product claim does not patentable distinguish the product because what is given patentably consideration is the product itself and not the manner in which the product was made. Therefore, the patentability of a product is independent of how it was made.

Art Unit: 1745

Furthermore, applicants are still arguing the seal is formed of a certain material having selected properties and capabilities (the material used to form the seal) i.e. materials such as a thermosetting fluorine-containing material or thermosetting silicon (see amendment, page 4, third full paragraph). However, the present claims are silent as to a specific material and/or its composition. Although applicants have now included the limitation “having a viscosity” and “a certain degree of elasticity”, it is contended that any materials, in general, exhibit a degree of viscosity (the property of resistance to flow) and elasticity (the capability of a strained body to recover its size and shape after deformation). For that reason, in the absence of magnitudes further limiting the viscosity and/or elasticity properties, the examiner is concluding that the solid gasketing material of the prior art (regardless of its chemical and physical composition) exhibits certain degrees of viscosity and elasticity and therefore, it meets the requirement of being viscous and/or elastic.

With respect to the assertion, previously argued, that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a fuel cell having electrodes that are separate from a gas diffusion layer, and closer to a membrane. However, this assertion is respectfully disagreed with. In this regard, it is noted that the primary reference does, in fact, clearly teach or show in FIGURE 3 above a fuel cell 300 including a membrane electrode assembly (MEA) 310 comprising a solid polymer electrolyte 306, catalysts 308 and 308' which facilitate chemical reaction and sandwiched between the anode and cathode gas diffusion layers 312 and 312', respectively. In that, it is pointed out that catalyst electrode materials 308 and 308' are separate layers themselves and are located closer to the solid polymer electrolyte membrane than respective gas diffusion layers. It is also noted that fuel cell electrodes are conventionally composed of the catalyst layer itself which facilitate

Art Unit: 1745

chemical reaction and the gas diffusion layer to diffuse the reacting gas. It appears the applicants are confusing the fluid flow plates 200 and 200' and their respective faces 202 and 202' acting as the anode side and the cathode side of the fuel cell as the particular anode catalytic electrode and cathode catalytic electrode. In general, the side wherein fuel reactant flows in or is introduced into is known as the anode side, whereas the side wherein oxidant reactant flows in or is introduced into is known as the cathode side. That is why the '933 patent is making reference to both the anode side and the cathode side of the fuel cell so as to provide structural orientation of the fuel cell components. However, the specific site where the electrochemical reaction takes place is in the membrane electrode assembly per se including the catalyst feature necessary to carry out such reaction. Hence, in view of the specific embodiment orientation and structural arrangement of the fuel cell components of the primary reference, the present claims remain anticipated.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Alejandro whose telephone number is (571) 272-1282. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00 am - 6:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1745

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raymond Alejandro
Examiner
Art Unit 1745

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RAM', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke underneath.